

SENATOR DECAMP: Ah, yes, Mr. President. I wonder and I need to ask a question of Senator Morehead. If we have truly become bogged down, let me ask the question. As I read it, the Haberman amendment starts out at, let's say, point zero and makes the provision on when you could be arrested, or whatever. Then Senator Morehead puts an amendment on, and you correct me if I'm wrong, Senator Morehead, but the way I read it you go exactly the rest of the way around the circle and you come exactly back to zero so that whatever the Haberman amendment was going to do is 100 percent neutralized by your amendment, and you are exactly where the bill is right now, except you've adopted two amendments. Is that essentially correct?

SENATOR MOREHEAD: Senator DeCamp, it is my feeling that with the adoption of both of these amendments that we would now have redundant language in this piece of legislation. Yes, Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: So in other words, if we do absolutely nothing, we will be in exactly the same position as if we adopt your amendment and Senator Haberman's amendment. Is that correct?

SENATOR MOREHEAD: That is my feeling, Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Well, I suggest we either do nothing, or if you want to do something, you do not adopt Senator Morehead's amendment because the only "something" is Senator Haberman's amendment which is neutralized by Senator Morehead's amendment. So either...why don't you just withdraw your amendment and vote against his amendment, Senator Morehead?

SENATOR MOREHEAD: But, Senator DeCamp, if Senator Haberman's amendment would happen to pass without my amendment then we would not be where I would like the bill to be.

SENATOR DECAMP: Oh. Oh, well I guess my point is it would seem more reasonable, rather than amending his amendment, to do exactly what the bill says now, the more direct course, and I realize it is rather stupid to be suggesting doing something direct in here. But anyway...